

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 and 23-30 have been examined. New claims 31 and 32 have been added to more fully describe the patentable aspects of the invention.

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-7 and 23-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

A. Claims 2, 3, 11 and 12

The Examiner asserts that claims 11 and 12 are not clear because parent claims 2 and 3 are directed to a “manufacture method of an inspection” while the recitation of claims 11 and 12 are directed to servo writing. In addition, the Examiner asserts that claims 2 and 3 are not clear because of the phrase “manufacture of an inspection”, in which an inspection is a method process. Therefore, Applicants amend claims 2, 3, 11 and 12 for clarity and traverse this rejection.

Claims 2 and 3 recite a manufacture method of an inspection use tape. Thus, claims 2 and 3 do not claim the manufacturing method of an inspection, but instead claim the manufacturing method of an article (i.e., the inspection use tape), which is used for an inspection of a magnetic tape drive.

Furthermore, claims 11 and 12 define an apparatus for carrying out the manufacturing method of the inspection use tape. That is, claims 11 and 12 recite the inspection use tape is manufactured within a servo writer, which produces the inspection use tape by implementing the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 10/727,046 (Q78736)

manufacture method of claims 2 and 3, respectively. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection.

B. Claim 10

The Examiner asserts that claim 10 is not clear because of the dependency of the claim. However, Applicants note that claim 10 is an independent claim.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-10, 23 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Baca et al. (US 5,574,602). Applicants traverse this rejection.

A. Claim 1

Claim 1 recites “running an inspection use tape in which a servo signal is written to meander in a width direction of said inspection use tape and is displaced at a predetermined frequency and amplitude in said width direction”, which the Examiner asserts is disclosed by Baca. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Baca appears to disclose processing servo signals read from a plurality of servo areas for a magnetic tape. In particular, Baca discloses sensing plural track lateral position indicators to generate sensed position error signals (col. 2, lines 23-25). Figure 4 of Baca shows servo track areas 40-42, extending laterally across the length of the magnetic tape 21, such that the lateral spacing between servo track areas 40-42 is an optimum spacing for reducing errors caused by magnetic tape defects (col. 4, lines 45-54). In other words, Baca discloses that the servo signals are recording in a straight line and remain in a lateral alignment across the width of the magnetic tape. Baca, however, does not disclose that a servo signal is written to meander in a width direction of said inspection use tape and is displaced at a predetermined frequency and amplitude, as recited by claim 1.

Therefore, Baca fails to disclose each and every feature of claim 1 and claim 1 is patentable for at least this reason.

B. Claims 2 and 3

Since claims 2 and 3 contain features that are similar to the features of claim 1, claims 2 and 3 are patentable for reasons analogous to those presented above. In particular, Baca fails to disclose writing a servo signal in said magnetic tape to meander in a width direction of said magnetic tape at a predetermined frequency and amplitude.

C. Claim 10

Claim 10 recites, *inter alia*, “said position detected by said optical sensor is continuously monitored such that said head unit continuously tracks said servo signal.” Baca, however, appears to disclose that during recording and reading operations, the head position is determined only on a periodic basis, and recording is prohibited if an unacceptable change in head position is detected (col. 2, lines 47-52). Therefore, it appears that Baca does not disclose continually moving the head unit to constantly track a servo signal. That is, Baca does not disclose that the position detected by said optical sensor is continuously monitored such that said head unit continuously tracks said servo signal. Applicants submit that claim 10 is patentable for at least this reason.

D. Claims 4-9, 23 and 24

Applicants submit that the remaining claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 25-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baca in view of Bui et al. (US 6,963,467). Bui, however, does not correct the deficiencies of Baca with regard to claims 1-3. In particular, Figure 2 of Bui shows that servo tracks 230-234 comprise of longitudinal servo patterns, prerecorded on the magnetic tape 200 for track following at these positions (col. 8, lines 48-62). Therefore, like Baca, Bui merely teaches that the servo signals are recording in a straight line across the length of the magnetic tape. Bui, however, does not teach that a servo signal is written to meander in a width direction of the inspection use tape and is displaced at a predetermined frequency and amplitude, as recited by claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 25-30 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies.

IV. New claims

By this Amendment, Applicants have added new claims 31 and 32 to further define the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit claims 31 and 32 recite additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 10/727,046 (Q78736)

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860


WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 20, 2007

Respectfully submitted,


Susan P. Pan
Registration No. 41,239